AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Figures 1 and 2 with the attached Replacement Sheets of both figures.

Attachment: Drawings (2 Pages)

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1, 9-12 and 20-22 are being amended.

I. Drawings

The Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), stating that the first transmission channel, second transmission channel, voice data and configuration data must be shown or the features canceled from the claims.

The Applicant respectfully submits that the first and second transmission channels are conventional features of a communication network, and as such, their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention. A person of ordinary skill in the art would understand from the illustrated diagram in Fig. 1 that the arrows between the communication networks and servers represent information being transmitted over transmission channels, and would not need to see a specific first and second transmission channel in order to understand the inventive aspects of the pending application. As such, the Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner additionally objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(o), and indicated that the drawings should clearly identify items of the invention without reference to the specification.

The Applicant herein submits replacement sheets for Figures 1 and 2, reflecting changes to the figures to more clearly identify the labeled items in the drawings. No new matter has been entered.

II.   Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to claims 1-22 for having parenthesized reference characters in the claims that create indefiniteness.

The Applicant herein amends claims 1, 9-12 and 20-22 to remove the parentheticals, and requests that the objection to claims 1-22 be withdrawn.

III.   Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mani (US 2002/0188725A1), and in further view of Clark (US 5,490,251) and Katinakis, et al. (US6,389,039 B1).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees, and submits that Mani, Clark and Katinakis, taken alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest or provide the motivation required for an obviousness rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1

The Applicant submits that neither Mani, Clark nor Katinakis, taken alone or in combination, provide the requisite teaching, suggestion or motivation for the invention embodied in claim 1. The Examiner admits that Mani and Clark fail to teach sending data on a first

channel during a voice connection between at least two users on a second channel so as to make services available during the voice connection. However, the Examiner submits that Katinakis teaches sending data on one channel during a voice connection between two users on a second channel, so as to make services available during the voice connection.

However, Katinakis does not teach sending data during a voice connection *"so as to make at least some of said services offered by said second network available to said terminal during said voice connection"* as recited in claim 1. The invention embodied in claim 1 provides for sending configuration data on a first channel during a voice connection on a second channel *so that the user at a terminal is able to access services offered by a private network during the voice connection.* Katinakis is limited to the idea of merely "transferring data to and from a mobile station in a cellular telecommunications network." *Katinakis*, Abstract. Katinakis does not describe the elements of claim 1 where configuration data transferred on a first channel makes services of a second network available to a terminal during a voice connection, as specifically recited in claim 1. Katinakis also provides no teaching, suggestion or motivation for sending data on a separate channel during a voice connection on another channel so as to make services on a second network available to a terminal during the voice connection, as Katinakis is only concerned with maximizing a data transfer rate. Katinakis specifically states that "the present invention is a method of transferring information to and from a MS (mobile station) at a higher rate than is currently possible on the radio link." *Katinakis*, col. 2, lines 34-36.

As the Examiner admits that neither Mani nor Clark teach the element of claim 1 described above, the Applicant submits that claim 1 is not obvious in view of Mani, Clark and

Katinakis, taken alone or in combination. Therefore, the Applicant requests that the rejection

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-11

The Applicant additionally submits that claims 2-11 are allowable at least based on their

dependency to claim 1, and refers the Examiner to the comments below with regard to claims 4,

5 and 10.

Claims 12-22

Furthermore, as the Examiner rejected claims 12-22 based on the same rationale applied

to claims 1-11, respectively, the Applicant further submits that claim 12 is allowable for the

same reasons presented above with regard to claim 1. The Applicant also submits that claims

13-22 are allowable at least based on their dependency to claim 12.

Claim 4

Specifically with regard to claim 4, the Applicant submits that Mani fails to disclose

where "control means are adapted to send to said terminal identification data which, once

installed in said terminal, enables the automatic sending to said server of at least one secondary

identifier stored in the memory of said terminal," as recited in claim 4.

With regard to control means adapted to send identification data to the terminal, the

Examiner cites to the Abstract of Mani, stating that Mani "specifies invoking an access service

application." However, the access service application of Mani "is operable to interrogate the

user, either in an active manner, passive manner, or in any combination thereof, for multimedia

responses." *Mani*, para. [0009]. The access service application therefore does send

identification data to the terminal, as it is designed instead to *receive* a multimedia *response* from

the user at a terminal after the access service application interrogates the user. At no point does

Mani describe a control means "adapted to send to said terminal identification data," as recited in

claim 4.

The Examiner then cites to paragraph [0049] of Mani as "enabling the automatic sending

to said server of at least one secondary identifier stored in a memory of said terminal," as recited

in claim 4. However, paragraph [0049] of Mani does not describe the "automatic sending" of an

identifier, but simply that a lack of a response by a user may be considered a response by the

access service application. This is not the "automatic sending" of an identifier stored in a

memory of the terminal in Mani, as Mani still queries for live responses from the user before

deciding that the lack of a response from the user is acceptable. Therefore, the Applicant further

submits that Mani fails to disclose the elements of claim 4.

The Applicant submits that for at least the reasons stated above, neither Mani, Clark or

Katinakis teach, disclose or provide any motivation for the elements of claim 4. The Applicant

respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claim 5

The Applicant additionally submits that neither Mani, Clark nor Katinakis disclose the

elements of claim 5, as the security data being sent to the terminal described in claim 5 is not the

same as the interrogation that occurs in Mani. Mani describes interrogating the user at the

terminal, and the Examiner equates this with the sending of security data as recited in claim 5.

However, the security data is not interrogation or queries directed to the user, but information such as a "calculated authentication key" that the server uses to determine the status of the connection. *Specification*, p. 10, lines 19-23. Mani does not describe the use of "security data" such as information that is used to determine the status of the connection. Therefore, Mani fails to describe the elements of claim 5, of sending security data to the terminal after the configuration data.

Claim 10

With regard to claim 10, both Mani and Clark fail to disclose the elements of claim 10 as argued by the Examiner. Specifically, neither Mani nor Clark disclose the server of claim 10 where access to a network is inhibited "in the event of an attempt by said terminal to call a remote terminal," as recited in claim 10. Mani pertains to a "user verification scheme" that interrogates a user attempting to access a controlled facility--there is no attempt by the user at the terminal to *call* a remote terminal, as the user of a terminal does not "call" another remote terminal. Mani specifically states that when a user attempts to *access* a controlled facility, a multimedia call/session engine is invoked for launching an access service application that interrogates the user. *Mani*, paras. [0008] - [0009]. Therefore, if anything in Mani could be described as a call, it would be the access service application contacting the user at the terminal to verify the user's access capabilities. However, claim 10 is directed to a user at a terminal attempting to call another remote terminal, which does not occur in Mani, since Mani is not directed to making calls.

Further, Clark also fails to describe the elements of claim 10, as Clark only discusses transmitting caller ID information, without any discussion pertaining to the use of configuration data inhibiting access to a network. Clark pertains simply to transmitting data over a signaling channel without using voice or data channels, and has nothing to do with a user making a call to another user while configuration data and services are being provided from a private network to a public network.

For at least these reasons, the Applicant submits that neither Mani nor Clark, taken alone or in combination, teach the elements of claim 10 as required for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Scott H. Davison/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Scott H. Davison
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 52,800
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 10, 2008